

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 31, 39, 44, 49 and 58-60 have been amended. Claims 1-30, 37-38, 47 and 54-57 were cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 31-36, 39-46, 48-53 and 58-60 are presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 31-36, 39-41, 44-46, 48-51 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 ("Rajasekharan"), in view of Xie, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,393 ("Xie") and further in view of Abdulhayoglu, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0030784 ("Abdulhayoglu").

Claim 31, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

generating a unique validation key associated with a data stream, the unique validation key to map the data stream with a source, wherein the unique validation key is generated based on a combination of a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key;

generating the data stream;

storing the unique validation key;

embedding the unique validation key in the data stream to form a validation key embedded data stream, wherein the validation key embedded data stream is to ensure that the data stream includes content intended for an associated destination, wherein the validation key is embedded in the data stream wrapped by predetermined data, the predetermined data including a number of predetermined bytes to precede and trail the validation key, wherein the validation key is obtained prior to requesting the data stream; and

sending the validation key embedded data stream to the associated destination.

(emphasis added)

Rajasekharan discloses “a method for *secure streaming of digital audio/visual content*. Secure streaming provides *protection against unauthorized use* of digital content.” (Abstract; emphasis provided). Rajasekharan further discloses that the method “checks [a] digital signature, or other source indicator, in the authorization data *to determine whether the authorization data is received from an authorized source. The digital signature can be*, for example, either a Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA) signature . . . or a Rivest Shamir Adleman (RSA) algorithm.” (col. 4, lines 28-33; emphasis provided).

Xie discloses “a *message authentication code (“MAC”)* that is attached to digital content.” (col. 1, lines 27-29; emphasis provided). Watermarking is an example of a MAC system. A watermark is “*embedded in the media stream*, so that removal of the watermark may destroy or visibly alter the underlying content.” (col. 1, lines 32-38; emphasis provided).

Abdulahayoglu discloses a “method of displaying a feature related to a web-page.” (Abstract). Abdulahayoglu further discloses that a “web-page owner obtains a *digital certificate . . . from a trusted source*. The digital certificate is signed by the trusted source and includes . . . data to provide the logo, company name and actual URL, together with *acceptable payment method logos*.” (page 3, paragraph 84; emphasis provided).

Claim 31, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “embedding the unique validation key in the data stream to form a validation key embedded data stream, wherein the validation key embedded data stream is to ensure that the data stream includes content intended for an associated destination, wherein the validation key is embedded in the data stream wrapped by predetermined data, the predetermined data including a number of

predetermined bytes to precede and trail the validation key, wherein the validation key is obtained prior to requesting the data stream” (emphasis added). Rajasekharan, Xie, and Abdulihayoglu, neither individually nor when combined in any combination, teach or reasonably suggest at least this limitation of claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 contain limitations similar to those of claims 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 and their dependent claims.

Claims 42, 43, 52 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan in view of Xie and further in view of Willis, Jr., et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815 (“Willis”).

Claims 44-46 and 48 are rejected for the same reasons cited above regarding claims 31, 32, 35 and 33, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

Claims 58 and 60 are rejected for the same reasons cited above regarding claims 31 and 35, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

Claims 42-43, 45-46, 48, 52-53 and 60 depend from one of independent claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 and thus include all the limitations of the corresponding base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-43, 45-46, 48, 52-53 and 60.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 14, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980